



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,476	03/19/2004	Darrell Orvin Wagner	GUID.628PA	7258

51294 7590 12/08/2006

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC
8009 34TH AVE S.
SUITE 125
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55425

EXAMINER

BERTRAM, ERIC D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3766

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/804,476

Applicant(s)

WAGNER ET AL.

Examiner

Eric D. Bertram

Art Unit

3766

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/6/04.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-60 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/6/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-26 in the reply filed on 11/06/06 is acknowledged. However, based on the Applicant's arguments and amendments, the Restriction Requirement has been withdrawn. As a result, claims 1-60 will be examined in this detailed action.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 7/6/04 was filed in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to

Art Unit: 3766

be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-60 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11-57 of U.S. Patent No. 7,047,071.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because if all of the surface electrode locations were rejected using the method of the current application, then a subject would inherently not be suitable to receive a subcutaneous defibrillation device, as described in the patent. In other words, the same invention is being described, albeit in different terms, in both the current application and the patent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 3766

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 1-8, 11-15, 18-24, 27, 34-36, 41, 44, 45, 48, 50 and 53-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weiss in view of KenKnight (US 6,148,230). Weiss discloses an electrode placement method utilizing a plurality of electrodes 38 and 50 attached in a fixed geometrical relationship to a support structure 33, wherein the electrodes are connected to a pulse generator (col. 3, lines 63-67, col. 5, lines 1-2 and col. 8, lines 20-24). The electrodes are placed at various locations on the surface of the heart and patient threshold is tested at each location in order to find a desired stimulating location (col. 5, lines 3-6). As a result, multiple locations may be probed and rejected until an electrode location is selected. The testing of a patient threshold inherently relates to determining the minimum pacing level required to capture the heart. Therefore, a desired stimulating location will have a minimum pacing level that meets predetermined requirements. Once this location is found, the lead is affixed at the subcutaneous location on the heart (col. 5, lines 6-12). However, Weiss does not

Art Unit: 3766

disclose utilizing electrodes that are placed on a thorax of a patient which relate to subcutaneous electrode locations.

9. Attention is directed to the secondary reference of KenKnight, which discloses a plurality of electrodes 22, 24, 26 all located on a support structure 20 for the purpose of pacing a heart (col. 2, lines 33-38). KenKnight discloses that the electrodes "are positioned on the thorax of the patient" while also being implanted under the surface of the skin (col. 2, lines 39-48). In other words, once implanted, the electrodes are both "on a thorax" and subcutaneous. Therefore, if the method of Weiss was carried out using the electrode positions and teaching of KenKnight, once a desired pacing location was found, it would inherently correspond to an acceptable subcutaneous electrode location. Furthermore, KenKnight is silent as to how the exact locations of the electrodes are determined. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to use the electrode placement method of Weiss with the electrodes and locations as taught by KenKnight in order to find the locations that allow the lowest pacing levels possible, which helps to decrease both the pain felt by the patient and the drain that occurs on the battery with each pacing pulse.

10. Regarding claims 8 and 41, the two electrodes of Weiss is considered to be an array.

11. Regarding claims 11, 12, 22, 23 and 35, the support structure 33 is also considered a housing, and when the electrodes are implanted at a selected location, the structure is inherently implanted as well.

Art Unit: 3766

12. Regarding claims 13 and 14, if all of the locations are rejected, then a patient is inherently not suitable to receive a subcutaneous cardiac stimulation system.

13. Regarding claims 15, 24, 55 and 57, the electrodes will inherently be placed in relation to various parts of the heart.

14. Regarding claims 53 and 56, Weiss discloses rotating the electrode 50 relative to the electrode 38 (see figure 5).

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ensanian (US 3,834,374) discloses a method for determining abnormalities under the skin by placing an electrode on the surface of the thorax.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric D. Bertram whose telephone number is 571-272-3446. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30-7.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert E. Pezzuto can be reached on 571-272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3766

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Eric D. Bertram
Examiner
Art Unit 3766

EDB



Robert E. Pezzuto
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3766